

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-32 were originally submitted.

Claims 33-40 were previously added.

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 to Gupta et al (Gupta).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta.

Claims 3-6 and 8-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,551 to Wu et al (Wu).

Claims 1-40 remain in this application.

**35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 to Gupta et al (Gupta). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims.

Independent claim 1 recites in part "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request, wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

Gupta fails to teach or suggest the method of claim 1. Gupta describes "[a] method and apparatus for authenticating users" (i.e., clients), where "[o]ne or more embodiments of the invention may utilize cookies to aid in the authentication process". See abstract of Gupta.

Browsers may send (forward) requests and any associated cookies to the application server. Gupta, col. 11 lines 46-48. "To locate a session, the cookie that is forwarded from the browser may be examined and compared to sessions

1 currently active. If no cookie is forwarded from the browser, the session is not  
2 valid". Gupta, col. 11 line 66 to col. 12 line 6.

3 A user may issue a logout request to the server by entering a logout URL at  
4 the browser or clicking a link on the browser. To effectuate the logout, the  
5 browser may send the request to the server (i.e., application server and login  
6 server), and forward the associated cookie with the request. Gupta col. 13 lines  
7 45-51. The cookie identifies the user that is requesting the logout. "Without the  
8 cookie, the server may not know who is requesting a logout." Gupta col. 13 lines  
9 54-55.

10 The server determines if the cookie is valid. If the cookie is valid, the  
11 application server may invalidate the current session for the user and send back a  
12 notification to the browser that the user has been logged out. If the cookie is not  
13 valid, the server may do nothing further or may notify the user that the request  
14 cannot be processed. Gupta col. 13 lines 57-64.

15 The server (i.e., login server) may force the user to logout because the time  
16 for the current session has expired. For example, if the user connection is  
17 terminated prior to logging out (e.g., user modem is turned off). The user is  
18 automatically logged out by terminating the session. To logout a user, the  
19 application server may check with the login server to see if the user session is still  
20 valid. If still valid, the application server may reset the time period for that  
21 session. If the session is no longer valid, the application server may destroy the  
22 session causing the rejection of further requests from the user (browser). Gupta  
23 col 13 line 65 to col. 14 line 10.

24 Claim 1 recites "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the  
25 request, wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

1 The Office presents that "Gupta inherently teaches expiring cookies from  
2 the browser by teaching that the cookie (which contains the information regarding  
3 whether or not the user is logged in) is forwarded to the application server - by  
4 way of a browser - in order to invalidate (that is, to expire) the current session -  
5 which inherently requires the cookie to reflect the changed log-in status and  
6 thereby expire them".

7 Applicants do not disagree with the Office in that Gupta teaches a cookie is  
8 forwarded (sent) from the browser; however, such a cookie is used to identify the  
9 user to the application server and login server. The cookie described in Gupta is  
10 used to login and/or validate the user by information to server as to who the user is,  
11 not to provide information as to whether the user is logged in or not, as the Office  
12 contends.

13 There is nothing in Gupta that teaches or shows that the cookie from the  
14 browser is ever expired. As discussed, Gupta teaches a cookie that contains user  
15 information used to identify the user to the application server and login server. If  
16 such a cookie is expired from the browser, there would be no cookie that the  
17 browser can send to the login server and "[w]ithout the cookie, the server may not  
18 know who is requesting a logout."

19 In performing a logout, Gupta relies on validating the user through the  
20 cookie that identifies the user. Therefore if the cookie is expired or retired, there  
21 would not be a cookie to send to allow the logout procedure.

22 Accordingly, Gupta does not show every element of claim 1, and the  
23 rejection of claim 1 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully  
24 request that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.  
25

1       **Independent claim 7** recites in part "causing a request for data from the  
2 server to be issued by the browser, wherein the request causes the server to expire  
3 cookies from the browser". As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails  
4 to teach or show cookies that are expired from the browser.

5       Accordingly, Gupta does not show every element of claim 7, and the  
6 rejection of claim 7 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully  
7 request that the §102 rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

8  
9       **35 U.S.C. §103**

10       Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over  
11 Gupta.

12       **Dependent claim 2** depends from claim 1, and comprises the element  
13 "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request, wherein the  
14 cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

15       As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring  
16 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to  
17 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,  
18 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

19       The Office maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary  
20 skill in art to combine to acknowledge a successful logout as further recited in the  
21 element of claim 2 "wherein the request further causes the server to send an image  
22 to the browser which is indicative of successful logout". However, since Gupta  
23 fails to teach or suggest expiring cookies from the browser, it would not have been  
24 obvious to combine Gupta with what the Office maintains as what was obvious to  
25 one of ordinary skill in the art.

1 Accordingly, Gupta does not show every element of claim 2, and the  
2 rejection of claim 2 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully  
3 request that the §103 rejection of claim 2 be withdrawn.

4  
5 Claims 3-6 and 8-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being  
6 unpatentable over Gupta in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,551 to Wu et al (Wu).

7 Dependent claim 3 depends from claim 1, and therefore comprises the  
8 element "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,  
9 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

10 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring  
11 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to  
12 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,  
13 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

14 The Office relies on Wu as teaching "the method wherein multiple servers  
15 are logged out by selection of a single logout link". However, Wu provides no  
16 assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 3. Since Gupta does  
17 not teach or suggest "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the  
18 request, wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server", it  
19 would not have been obvious to combine "the method wherein multiple servers are  
20 logged out by selection of a single logout link" as taught by Wu.

21 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 3  
22 and the rejection of claim 3 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants  
23 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn.

24 Dependent claim 26 depends from claim 24, and therefore comprises the  
25 element "providing a link to an expire cookies page on each server in the form of

1 an image source tag that when called causes each server to expire cookies on both  
2 the server and user's browser, and to provide an image back to the browser upon  
3 succeeding in logging out the user".

4 As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to teach  
5 expiring cookies from the user's browser, since doing so would defeat the  
6 teachings of Gupta to use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the  
7 cookie, as taught by Gupta, the user would not be able to perform a logout from  
8 the server.

9 The Office relies on Wu as teaching "the method wherein multiple servers  
10 are logged out by selection of a single logout link". However, Wu provides no  
11 assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 26. Since Gupta does  
12 not teach or suggest "... expire cookies on ... user's browser", it would not have  
13 been obvious to combine "the method wherein multiple servers are logged out by  
14 selection of a single logout link" as taught by Wu.

15 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 26  
16 and the rejection of claim 26 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants  
17 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

18 **Dependent claim 4** depends from claim 1, and therefore comprises the  
19 element "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,  
20 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

21 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring  
22 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to  
23 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,  
24 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.  
25

1 The Office relies on Wu as teaching "the method wherein the logout link  
2 may be located on any of the multiple servers and an authentication server".  
3 However, Wu provides no assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of  
4 claim 4. Since Gupta does not teach or suggest "expiring cookies from the  
5 browser in accordance with the request, wherein the cookies include data provided  
6 to the browser by the server", it would not have been obvious to combine "the  
7 method wherein the logout link may be located on any of the multiple servers and  
8 an authentication server" as taught by Wu.

9 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 4  
10 and the rejection of claim 4 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants  
11 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

12 **Dependent claim 5** depends from claim 1, and therefore comprises the  
13 element "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,  
14 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

15 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring  
16 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to  
17 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,  
18 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

19 The Office relies on Wu as teaching "the method wherein a visited sites  
20 cookie maintains a list of all sites logged into by the user". However, Wu provides  
21 no assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 5. Since Gupta  
22 does not teach or suggest "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with  
23 the request, wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the  
24 server", it would not have been obvious to combine "the method wherein a visited  
25 sites cookie maintains a list of all sites logged into by the user" as taught by Wu.

1 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 5  
2 and the rejection of claim 5 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants  
3 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

4 Dependent claim 6 depends from claim 1, and therefore comprises the  
5 element "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,  
6 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

7 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring  
8 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to  
9 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,  
10 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

11 The Office relies on Wu as teaching "the method wherein selected cookies  
12 are expired to log out of the server". However, Wu provides no assistance in light  
13 of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 6. Since Gupta does not teach or  
14 suggest "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,  
15 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server", it would  
16 not have been obvious to combine "the method wherein selected cookies are  
17 expired to log out of the server" as taught by Wu.

18 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 6  
19 and the rejection of claim 6 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants  
20 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 6 be withdrawn.

21 Claims 8-9 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of  
22 claims 2-3. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in support of claims 2-3,  
23 in support of claims 8-9.  
24  
25



1 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claims  
2 8-9 and the rejection of claims 8-9 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants  
3 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 8-9 be withdrawn.

4 Claims 10, 15-18 and 24 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in  
5 the rejection of claims 1-3. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in  
6 support of claims 1-3, in support of claims 10, 15-18 and 24.

7 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claims  
8 10, 15-18 and 24 and the rejection of claims 10, 15-18 and 24 is therefore  
9 improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of  
10 claims 10, 15-18 and 24 be withdrawn.

11 Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of  
12 claims 1-3 and 5. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in support of  
13 claims 1-3 and 5, in support of claim 11.

14 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 11  
15 and the rejection of claim 11 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants  
16 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

17 Claims 12, 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-40 are rejected for the same reasons  
18 as set forth in the rejection of claim 5. Applicants assert the arguments as  
19 presented in support of claims 5, in support of claims 12, 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-  
20 40.

21 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claims  
22 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-40 and the rejection of claims 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-  
23 40 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the  
24 §103 rejection of claims 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-40 be withdrawn.  
25

1       **Dependent claims 14** depends from claim 11, and therefore comprises the  
2 element "a module that provides a link to an expire cookies page on each server  
3 that when called causes each server to expire cookies on the user's browser, and to  
4 provide an image back to the browser upon succeeding in logging the user out".

5       As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to teach  
6 expiring cookies on the user's browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings  
7 of Gupta to use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as  
8 taught by Gupta, the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

9       The Office maintains that "[a]t the time the invention was made, it would  
10 have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow the request for a  
11 logout page to be initiated via more than one server page". However, this assertion  
12 by the Office provides no assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited system of  
13 claim 14. Since Gupta does not teach or suggest "to expire cookies on the user's  
14 browser" it would not have been obvious to combine the Office's assertion.

15       Accordingly, Gupta in view of the Office's assertion does not show every  
16 element of claim 14 and the rejection of claim 14 is therefore improper.  
17 Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 14 be  
18 withdrawn.

19       **Dependent claim 27** is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the  
20 rejection of claim 14. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in support of  
21 claims 14, in support of claim 27.

22       Accordingly, Gupta in view of the Office's assertion does not show every  
23 element of claim 27 and the rejection of claim 27 is therefore improper.  
24 Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 27 be  
25 withdrawn.

1       **Dependent claim 19** depends from claim 18, and therefore comprises the  
2 element "retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image requests".

3       As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to retiring  
4 cookies, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to use a cookie to  
5 validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta, the user would  
6 not be able to perform a logout from the server.

7       The Office takes Official Notice "that a checkmark image is a symbol for  
8 affirmative, a positive result, or a task complete was well known in the art at the  
9 time the invention was made". However, the Official Notice taken provides no  
10 assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 19. Since Gupta does  
11 not teach or suggest "retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image  
12 requests" it would not have been obvious to combine the Official Notice taken by  
13 the Office.

14       Accordingly, Gupta in view of Official Notice does not show every element  
15 of claim 19 and the rejection of claim 19 is therefore improper. Accordingly,  
16 Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

17       **Dependent claim 20** depends from claim 18, and therefore comprises the  
18 element "retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image requests".

19       As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to retiring  
20 cookies, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to use a cookie to  
21 validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta, the user would  
22 not be able to perform a logout from the server.

23       The Office maintains that "[a]t the time the invention was made, it would  
24 have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to ensure that any piece of  
25 data downloaded was the most current". However, this assertion by the Office

1 provides no assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 20.  
2 Since Gupta does not teach or suggest "retiring cookies identified by responses to  
3 the get image requests" it would not have been obvious to combine the Office's  
4 assertion.

5 Accordingly, Gupta in view of the Office's assertion does not show every  
6 element of claim 20 and the rejection of claim 20 is therefore improper.  
7 Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 20 be  
8 withdrawn.

9 Dependent claim 21 depends from claim 18, and therefore comprises the  
10 element "retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image requests".

11 As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to retiring  
12 cookies, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to use a cookie to  
13 validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta, the user would  
14 not be able to perform a logout from the server.

15 The Office takes Official Notice "including a query in an image tag in a  
16 computer networking environment was well known in the art at the time the  
17 invention was made". However, the Official Notice taken provides no assistance  
18 in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 21. Since Gupta does not teach  
19 or suggest "retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image requests" it  
20 would not have been obvious to combine the Official Notice taken by the Office.

21 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Official Notice does not show every element  
22 of claim 21 and the rejection of claim 21 is therefore improper. Accordingly,  
23 Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.  
24  
25

1       **Claims 29-32** are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection  
2 of claims 18, 20, and 21. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in support  
3 of claims 18, 20, and 21, in support of claims 29-32.

4       Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu, Office's assertion, and Official notice  
5 does not show every element of claims 29-32 and the rejection of claims 29-32 is  
6 therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103  
7 rejection of claims 29-32 be withdrawn.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**CONCLUSION**

All pending claims 1-40 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 10/21/04

By: 

Emmanuel A. Rivera  
Reg. No. 45,760  
(509) 324-9256 ext. 245